DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 783 JC 720 019

TITLE	Leadership Development Training Program for Administrators of New and Developing Junior Colleges. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Auburn Univ., Ala.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D. C. Bureau of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Inservice Education; *Inservice Programs; *Junior Colleges; *Professional Training; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Auburn University (Alabama) sponsored a project to bring together persons from several Southeastern states practicing, or aspiring to practice, a particular speciality in junior college education. An in-service and a resident group were served. Sixty persons were involved in the in-service portion that consisted largely of a 2-week conference. The 26 individuals in the resident portion also participated in the 2-week conference, but continued for a year of full-time study at the university structured like an actual or potential junior college career field. Precise objectives specified for the in-service phase were: (1) improve participant competency in his specialty, (2) increase specialist-role awareness in the junior college scheme, (3) create appreciation for the junior college's expanding role, (4) encourage people knowledgeable about junior colleges to return to them and provide leadership, and (5) prepare some to lead in the development and operation of educational programs for the disadvantaged. The specific objectives for the resident phase included the above and the development of (1) leaders to solve Southeastern junior college problems, and (2) a procedure to maximize junior college leadership. Project organization, planning, and implementation to achieve these objectives are discussed, as well as the evaluation of the outcomes. Descriptive tables and charts of participant characteristics and instruments used in the evaluation are included. (AL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED057783

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAM FOR ADMINISTRATORS OF NEW AND DEVELOPING JUNIOR COLLEGES

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 69-0745.1
Grant No. 1, NIH # 41-0915

Division of College Support
Bureau of Higher Education

E. B. Moore, Jr.
Project Director

JC 720 019

August 1971

This Project was conducted pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and in cooperation with that agency, the Alabama State Department of Education, and Alabama Junior Colleges.

AUBURN UNIVERSITY
Auburn, Alabama

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 27 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

Need for the Project

Junior college growth in the Southeastern United States has been even more phenomenal than their growth nationally. In the eight-state region comprised of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, there were 227 two-year institutions in operation during 1969-1970.

Expansion in the number of colleges and increased enrollments have resulted necessarily in an increase in the number of faculty and administrative leadership positions. Thus, the problems associated with rapid growth and expansion of junior college programs have been thrust upon new and inexperienced leadership personnel.

In order to solve cumulative and new problems and at the same time consider and channel the future direction of the junior college in the Southeast, leadership personnel must have the opportunity to develop special and specific competencies. It is obvious that growth and the complexity inherent therein requires division of labor and, therefore, specialization of faculty and staff. Yet, division and specialization create communication problems which inhibit cooperation among specialized groups. This is just one problem which junior college leadership must face.

To strengthen junior college programs through capable leadership personnel--and ultimately to better serve the junior college student--there is a great need for leadership development programs which have been specifically designed to deal with existing and expected problems, as well as with problem-solving techniques per se.

Purpose

The purpose of the project was to bring together persons from the several Southeastern states who were practicing or aspiring to practice a particular specialty in junior college education so that they might participate in planned activities necessitating full consideration of the part played by each specialty in a concerted leadership effort. There was an attempt to see that activities undertaken would demand consideration of regional influences upon the junior college and thus to enable participants to better understand their state in relation to the Southeastern region.

Two specific groups were served. The in-service portion of the project engaged approximately sixty persons who comprised administrative teams of junior colleges in the consideration of common problems and to evaluate possible solutions through cooperative action.

The resident phase brought together twenty-six persons who represented a variety of specialties generally designated as part of junior college education for a concentrated program of activity extending over one calendar year. The participants were organized into administrative teams in

order to define problems and to apply specialized leadership skills in solving those problems.

Objectives

The specific functions of the in-service phase of the project were as follows:

A. Improve the competency of each participant in his own specialty.

B. Increase the awareness of each specialist of the role of his specialty in the scheme of the junior college and the relationship of this specialty to the other specialties and the total enterprise.

C. Create an appreciation for the expanding role of the junior college and its potential for providing a wide range of educational experiences.

D. Provide persons of expanded vision and understanding of junior colleges and junior college students to return to institutions and provide positive leadership for development and growth of students, faculty, and institutions.

E. Prepare persons to assume leadership in the development and operation of educational programs for disadvantaged persons.

The specific objectives for the resident phase included the above and the following additional objectives:

A. Development of a procedure to provide educational

leadership for solution of problems common to junior colleges in the Southeast.

B. Development of a procedure to maximize educational leadership in each junior college based upon a broad perspective of the varied functions of leadership.

Project Organization

Auburn University conducted the program and handled all administrative and instructional matters. Each of the participating junior colleges was represented in all phases of planning the project and each was encouraged to designate persons to attend both the resident and non-resident phase of the program.

The project staff was carefully selected to insure that competent persons who had both training and experience were available to conduct the program. Consultants were also selected from a panel of outstanding practitioners and theorists in the field of junior college education. See Appendix A for a list of project staff.

The project program was divided into two separate but closely related phases. One phase consisted of an institute of two weeks' duration in which the sixty members of the in-service group and the twenty-six members of the resident group participated. In an additional phase the resident group was engaged in one calendar year of

study on the Auburn University campus. Throughout all activities an attempt was made to relate program activities to currently existing problems and to minimize the dysfunctional aspects frequently associated with leadership development programs.

METHOD

This section of the report presents a description of the activities which initiated the project, followed by project activities in chronological order, ending with conclusions and recommendations which were the result of the evaluation process.

Development of the Proposal

On May 27, 1968 the chief administrators of all Alabama Junior Colleges, the Director of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education, and representatives of Auburn University met in conference at Auburn University to discuss the leadership development needs of Alabama Junior Colleges and to outline a program to meet those needs.

This meeting was successful in structuring guidelines for the development of a leadership program. The conferees emphasized the need not only for a resident program but also for a concentrated program of in-service activities to assist those persons who were in leadership positions and who, because of the press of on-going activities, could not be spared to participate on a full-time basis.

As a result of this conference, Auburn University agreed to develop a program and a proposal for financial support under the provisions of the Educational Professions Development Act. A cooperative proposal was developed and approved by the consortium on August 26, 1968. In January, 1969, the United States Office of Education awarded the consortium a grant of $250,000 to conduct a leadership development program for one year.

At the end of the 1969-70 project when all evaluations indicated a high degree of success, there were many recommendations that the program be expanded to include states other than Alabama. A proposal to that effect was submitted and a grant of $250,000 was awarded for the project which is the subject of this report.

Recruitment of Participants

The recruitment effort consisted primarily of the announcement of the program through selected media and mailing of brochures to universities, junior colleges, and State Departments of Education in the Southereastern states. Recruitment for the in-service program was handled through the chief administrators of junior colleges. Each institution was responsible for nominating the leadership team to represent its staff. A total of sixty participants were nominated for the in-service phase.

Enrollment data for the Project is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

ENROLLMENT DATA

Inquiries Received	235
Applications Mailed	235
Completed Applications Received	110
Well Qualified Applicants	96
Applicants Offered Admission	96
Applicants Enrolled	86

Participant Selection

The sixty participants who were nominated by their respective institutions were accepted for participation in the in-service phase of the project.

The Project Staff made final selection of the resident members in April, 1970. Two who were among those originally selected declined and were replaced by alternates. Twenty-six individuals participated in the one-year project.

Description of Participants

The following data provide a brief tabular description of the participants. The data reflect primarily the status of the resident phase participants. There was no attempt to extract information as to degrees, areas of study, etc., for the in-service group. A list of resident and in-service participants are found in Appendix F and G respectively.

Table 2

DISTRIBUTION BY STATE OF IN-SERVICE
AND RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS

State	In-Service	Resident
Alabama	38	13
California	1	
Florida	4	4
Georgia	4	3
Illinois	2	1
Iowa	1	
Louisiana	2	
Mississippi	1	2
North Carolina	1	
Virginia	6	3
TOTAL	60	26

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS
BY POSITION HELD AT TIME OF ENTRY

Position	Number Resident
Dean of Instruction	1
Dean of Students	2
Business Manager	1
Other Administrator	5
Div./Dept. Chairman	5
Student Personnel	2
Faculty Member	8
Other	2
TOTAL	26

Table 4

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT
PARTICIPANTS BY AGE

Age Group	Number	Percent
50 and over	1	4
40 - 49	4	16
30 - 39	16	61
20 - 29	5	19

Table 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY SEX

Sex	In-Service		Resident	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	41	68	23	89
Female	19	32	3	11

Table 6

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS
ACCORDING TO HIGHEST LEVEL OF STUDY
AT TIME OF ENTRY

Level of Study	Number
Master's Plus	7
Master's	17
Bachelor's	2

Table 7

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO ADMISSION TO DEGREE PROGRAM AT END OF PROJECT

Level	Number
Doctorate	19
Educational Specialist	6
Not Pursuing Degree	1

Development of Evaluation Procedures and Instruments

The process of developing evaluation procedures and instruments was guided primarily by the first two objectives as stated in the original proposal:

A. Improve the competency of each participant in his own specialty.

B. Increase the awareness of each specialist of the role of his specialty in the scheme of the junior college and the relationship of this specialty to the other specialties and the total enterprise.

Instruments and procedures for evaluation were developed and/or selected by the Project Staff. Information yielded by the 1969-1970 project evaluation supported the selection. These were combined with the use of the U. S. Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form. The principal evaluation effort was directed toward the resident group because there was more control over this group and the experiences were more extensive and varied than those of the in-service group. Evaluation of the in-service group was limited to the responses to the Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form. Detailed analysis of the data concerning the resident phase participants was completed by a member of the Project Staff in connection with his doctoral dissertation.

Description of the Evaluation Instruments

Instruments were utilized to determine the participant's:

1. Gain in knowledge acquired from the program.
2. Modification of attitudes and beliefs.
3. Ability to critically analyze the performance of himself and members of his team.
4. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the program.

In addition, certain personal data were obtained from the applications and other records associated with enrollment in graduate studies. Each resident participant engaged in quarterly conferences with the Project Director during

which time the individual progress was reviewed and suggestions received as to program modification.

The instruments used are described below:

Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form.--This form was developed by the U. S. Office of Education and furnished each participant. Copies of the completed evaluations were provided the Project Director and the U. S. Office of Education. The instrument is designed to provide demographic data, career goals, assessment of program activities, and a narrative summary evaluation.

Competency Profile.--This instrument was developed to assist participants in evaluating themselves and their teammates in the performance of duties as members of the leadership team of a simulated junior college. The instrument consisted of 46 items which sought to evaluate personal qualities, leadership competencies, knowledge of the task, and attitudes. Each student was required to evaluate himself and each of his teammates twice during the year. The results of these evaluations were held confidential and are not a part of this report. Only the project director was privy to all evaluations. The results as applicable to each participant were discussed by the Project Director and the participant involved. A copy of the instrument, rating scale, and instructions for its use are attached as Appendix B.

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values.--This instrument was used to measure the "relative prominence of six basic interest of motives in personality: the theoretical,

economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious." This instrument was administered to each of the resident participants at the beginning and end of the project year in an effort to determine any shifts in values which may have occurred as a result of project experiences.

Group Cohesiveness: A Study of Group Morale.--This instrument was used in an attempt to determine the effect of introducing change into the group, the extent of dissensions in the group, and the cohesiveness of the group. This instrument was also administered at the start and close of the resident year.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.--This instrument is designed to measure the extent to which a person's belief system is open or closed. Since the project sought to open the belief system of the participants, this instrument was administered to each resident participant at the beginning and end of the program.

Semantic Differential.--A semantic differential was designed to measure attitude toward selected junior college concepts. This instrument was administered to each resident participant at the beginning and end of the program in an effort to measure any change in attitude toward the selected concepts. (See Appendix E)

Operation of the Program

The project was designed to operate in two separate but interrelated phases. The resident phase was conducted on the Auburn University campus during the calendar year, June 1, 1970, to May 31, 1971. The in-service phase was

conducted at Auburn University, July 13-24, 1970.

The In-Service Phase

The in-service phase of the project was designed to bring together administrative teams from junior colleges in the Southeast so that leadership skills could be improved and brought to bear on the problems common to junior colleges within the region. States represented were: Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Mississipp Florida, Louisiana, Illinois, and Iowa. No organization exists whereby junior college leaders routinely meet periodically to share ideas and concentrate their leadership skills on existing problems.

An intensive two-week conference was scheduled at Auburn University during the weeks of July 13-24, 1970. Table 8 summarizes the program in terms of topics and consultants.

Table 8

IN-SERVICE CONFERENCE TOPICS AND CONSULTANTS

Date	Topic	Consultant
July 13	"The Two-year College of the 70's: emphasis on student learning"	E. B. Moore, Jr.
July 14	"Who are our students? What are their needs?"	Clifford Le Blanc
	"Meeting the challenges of a racially mixed student body"	Aaron Lamar Gilma N. Preus

Table 8--Continued

Date	Topic	Consultant
July 15	"Student services--their contribution to student development"	Don Creamer
	"Student development program at Santa Fe Junior College"	Joe Fordyce
July 16	"Organizing the college for instruction"	Richard C. Richardson
July 17	"Concerns of private colleges"	Troy Esslinger
	"Co-operative education, a look to the future"	Jack Westberry
	"Community Services, an opportunity for growth"	Clemens Wisch
July 20	"Developing new instructional strategies"	Horace Hartsell
	"Implementing instructional strategies"	Dick Smith
	"Involving students in their own education"	A. L. Cone
July 21	"Faculties for the '70's: characteristics, recruitment, selection, retention"	Jan Le Croy
	"The politics of education"	Laurence Iannacone
	"New developments in faculty-administration relationships"	Doug Williams
July 22	"Special needs of disadvantaged students"	Johnnie Ruth Clarke
	"Career programs for the '70's"	Jack Michie

Table 8 -- Continued

Date	Topic	Consultant
July 23	"Show and Tell-workshop results"	Participants
	"Reaction and Critique"	James Wattenbarger

Project staff members took an active part in all the conferences: served as discussion leaders, on panels, and presented papers on selected topics. In addition, the twenty-six participants in the residence phase of the Project attended all of the sessions.

The Resident Phase

The resident phase of the Project was designed to accomplish two major objectives. First, each of the participants was expected to increase his competencies in his own field of specialization. Second, in order to combat the dysfunctional aspects of over-specialization which often result in problems of communication and, in some cases, even a lack of mutual respect, program activities were designed to give each participant a better awareness and understanding of an appreciation for the role of other administrative specialists in the total operation of the institution. (See Appendix C for typical four-quarter program for each specialist.)

The residence phase provided stipend assistance to twenty students representing the five major specialities necessary for the effective operation of a community junior college. Six other students participated on a no-stipend basis. The specialties were: general administration, academic administration, technical or career education, business management, and student personnel services. Participants were selected so that each of the five specialties were represented by persons who either had work experience in that particular area of specialization or who aspired to a leadership position in that specialty and were recommended by their president or supervisor. In addition to each participant's being recommended by the chief administrator of his institution, each applicant was personally interviewed by a member of the Project Staff and was approved by the Project Admissions Committee.

Program Content and Activities

The resident phase of the Project extended over a twelve-month period beginning in June, 1970, and ending on May 31, 1971. Project activities included special, between-quarter experiences in addition to the scheduled activities which generally coincided with the regular academic calendar of the University.

In addition to formal courses in the various specialties and in supporting areas (e.g., curriculum, foundations of education, the behavioral sciences, etc.), special experiences and courses were arranged for Project

participants so that specific objectives could be achieved. Each quarter's activities are described below.

Summer Quarter, 1970.--Prior to the beginning of classes, the participants underwent three testing sessions utilizing the instruments which were selected by the Project Staff. The results of these pre-test data were used as a part of the evaluative criteria for the Project. (See the section of this report on Development of Evaluation Procedures and Instruments for a detailed description.)

Other pre-class activities included extensive counseling and orientation sessions, both group and individual, regarding the University itself, the purposes of the Project, and the career goals and appropriate curricular programs for each Project participant.

During the quarter each participant enrolled as a full-time student with a course load of from 16 to 17 quarter hours. All participants registered for a special section of the regularly offered course, IED 665, The Community College. This course dealt specifically with the history, philosophy, and development of the junior college and the problems and issues confronting the junior college educator today. (See Appendix D for course descriptions of the higher education sequence.) As an added dimension to this special section, one day per week was devoted to change and how the change process might be facilitated in the community college setting. The resident participants were actively involved in the in-service phase of the Project

during the weeks of July 13-24.

Early in the quarter the Project participants were divided into five administrative teams representing hypothetical junior colleges. Each team consisted of a President, a Dean of Instruction, a Dean of Career Education, a Dean of Student Personnel Services, and a Business Manager or Director of Business Affairs. (Each team was permitted to alter the titles of the various roles if they felt other titles more appropriate.)

A large, well-equipped room was made available to the Project on a year-round basis. The participants arranged the room so that each team was provided desk/work space as a team so that they could work together on team projects and problem-solving activities.

Fall Quarter, 1970.--During the pre-class period of the fall quarter, the resident participants were introduced to the use of simulation, role playing, in-basket techniques, and case studies. All of these techniques were new to most of the participants and a familiarity with these procedures was deemed necessary if maximum benefit was to be received from the extensive simulation problems which were to follow.

Each participant took a full course load of 15 quarter hours which included one common-experience course, AED 659, Practicum in Area of Specialization. This course consisted of a simulated junior college problem. Participants were provided with educational, demographic, and business and

industrial data for a small city and its surrounding area. They were given enabling legislation, minimum planning funds, and their own administrative team as a staff. Each team was provided with a "consultant" who was a member of the Project staff. In addition to weekly meetings with the total group, the separate teams met frequently both with their "consultant" and by themselves.

Beginning with the basic data provided, each team was required to plan surveys, select a site, plan campus development, and develop a curriculum. Planning began, of course, with the establishment of a college philosophy and set of objectives. Staffing patterns were developed as were criteria for the selection of faculty. The organizational structure of the college was developed, and so was a mechanism for faculty participation in the governance of the college. An operating budget for the first year was developed and facilities planning was carried to the schematic diagram stage. All of the activities were geared to a hypothetical opening for the college of September, 1971.

While the above activities--and the myriad auxiliary tasks that preceded and paralleled each major activity--were conducted separately by team, progress reports were made during weekly group meetings so that each team received practically continuous feedback from the other teams, its "consultant," and the other members of the Project Staff.

During the fall quarter, participants were given the opportunity to study innovative instructional methods in junior colleges in the Southeast. These visits were very valuable to the participants as they continued their work during the remainder of the year. Table 9 summarizes the travel experiences.

Table 9

COLLEGES IN WHICH INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS WERE OBSERVED

Participants	College	State
Clements	Pensacola J. C.	Florida
Mitchell	Okaloosa-Walton	Florida
Marsalis	North Florida J. C.	Florida
Alexander	Lake City J. C.	Florida
Anthony	Lake Sumter J. C.	Florida
Wooten	Daytona Beach J. C.	Florida
Vance	Santa Fe J. C.	Florida
Guth	Abraham Baldwin	Georgia
Underwood	North Greenville	S. Carolina
Blackwell	Durham Tech.	N. Carolina
	Northern Virginia	Virginia
	Central Piedmont	N. Carolina
	Danville C. C.	Virginia
Witty	Meridian J. C.	Mississippi
Warren		
Phillips	Kilgore College	Texas
Robbins	Dallas J. C. District	Texas
Cooper	Tarrant County J. C.	Texas
Thrower		
Kirchhoff		
Temple	Cuyahoga District	Ohio
Moody	Delta C. C.	Michigan
Bailey	Purdue University	Indiana
Roberts		

Winter Quarter, 1970.--Each participant took a full course load of 15 quarter hours which included one common-experience course, AED 659. This course was designed as an extension to the simulated junior college development problem and included introduction of new variables and problem situations to the exercise.

When the development plans were submitted early in 1971, each team was then directed to assume acceptance of its general plan and the time frame for the problem was moved forward to September, 1971.

During the remainder of the quarter, the simulation dealt with problem situations introduced on a weekly basis. As nearly as possible, these problems represented situations which might arise within a community college setting, and concerned faculty, students, community, administration, accreditation agencies, change processes, or other influencing forces.

Spring Quarter, 1970.--Each participant registered for a full course load which included a common-experience course, AED 651, Internship in Area of Specialization. Requirements for this course involved three discrete activities. The first was a weekly group meeting devoted to internship coordination and other group activities.

The second activity involved each team's spending 1 to 2 days per week for a two-week period observing and working in the Division of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education. Project participants

experienced a wide variety of activities and worked directly with the professional staff of the State Department of Education.

The third phase of the Internship required that each team engage in an actual problem-solving activity or project with an operating junior college. Each team spent a minimum of one day per week for five weeks on the campus of a Southeastern junior college. Table 10 outlines the Internship experiences.

Table 10

INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES OF RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS

Institution	Location	Activity/Project
DeKalb College	Atlanta, Georgia	Study of student personnel services, instructional program, business affairs, and general administrative policies.
Roane State	Roane County, Tennessee (Harriman)	Assisting staff in establishing curriculum for September, 1971, opening.
George C. Wallace State Technical Institute	Selma, Alabama	Assisting in early planning stages to prepare for 1971 opening.
Emmanuel College	Franklin Springs, Georgia	Community survey to improve educational service to the community.

Table 10--Continued

Institution	Location	Activity/Project
Division of Research and Higher Education, Alabama State Department of Education.	Montgomery, Ala.	Examining curriculum, financing, staffing, and general policy formulation in Alabama junior colleges.

At the end of the year's activities, extensive evaluative sessions were held concerning the Internship activities and experiences.

PROJECT EVALUATION

Evaluation of the Project incorporated both objective and subjective measures and was designed to determine the participant's:

1. Gain in knowledge acquired from the program.
2. Modification of attitudes and beliefs.
3. Ability to critically analyze the performance of himself and members of his team.
4. Satisfaction with the content, presentation and operation of the program.

Data used in evaluating the program were collected by use of the instruments described earlier in this report and are summarized in the following pages.

Resident Phase

Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form.--This instrument was completed by the twenty-six[1] resident participants. The respondents were in agreement that the program was integrated with their previous background and experience and that the program was about the right length. Data concerning responses of resident participants concerning the quality and characteristics of the training program are shown in Tables 11 and 12. Eighteen partitipants ranked the overall quality of the training program "outstanding."

---

[1] Twenty of the twenty-six resident participants were supported by the Project; six were non-supported participants.

Table 11

RESIDENT GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS ON SECTION B OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM CONCERNING OVERALL QUALITY OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Adequate	Poor	TOTAL
18	7	1	0	0	26

Table 12

RESIDENT GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS ON SECTION B OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM CONCERNING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Item	N/A*	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*	N
Curriculum	-	9	14	3	-	-	26
Internship	2	9	12	2	1	-	26
Administrative Arrangements (Learning Atmosphere	-	15	11	-	-	-	26
Administrative Arrangements (Time Schedule)	1	10	12	2	-	-	26
Full-time Staff	-	22	4	-	-	-	26
Part-time Staff	14	7	4	1	-	-	26
Consultants	1	9	14	1	-	-	26
Instructional Facilities	1	9	13	3	-	-	26
Group Rapport	-	10	14	-	1	-	26
Administration-Faculty-Participant Rapport	-	16	8	2	-	-	26

Table 12--Continued

Item	N/A*	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*	N
Selection Criteria for Participants	6	2	13	5	-	-	26
Provision for Follow-up of Participants	7	-	12	7	-	-	26

*Key: N/A Not Applicable
1 Outstanding
2 Very Good
3 Good
4 Adequate
5 Poor

The resident participants ranked the Full-time Staff as the strongest element of the program, with Administration-Faculty-Participant Rapport and Administrative Arrangements (Learning Atmosphere) following second and third respectively. Group Rapport and Administrative Arrangements (Time Schedule) received about the same support for a ranking of fourth and fifth. It is interesting to note that last year's group ranked Group Rapport as the strongest element, followed by Full-time Staff.

The most important aspect of the program was considered by the participants to be attitude change, followed in order by content and communication. Responses to this segment of Section B of the Participant Evaluation Form are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

RESIDENT RESPONSES TO ITEMS IN SECTION B

Item	N/A	Rank 1	Rank 2	TOTAL
Content		7	6	
Attitude Change		10	8	
Methodology		2	1	
Communication		4	8	
TOTAL RESPONDING				23
NOT USABLE OR NOT REPORTING				3
N				26

Typical comments contained in the summary evaluation of the Participant Evaluation Form were as follows:

Perceptions of Major Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

Well-prepared and highly motivated teachers and consultants.

Well-selected variety of geographical areas and junior college positions represented.

Experience of the participants.

Flexibility of the program.

Provided an opportunity for participants to face some real problems in an educational environment.

The chance to pursue individual interests within the context of the program.

The singularity of purpose and the sincereness with which the comprehensive community college idea remained the guiding and consistent theme of the entire program.

The concern for the participants.

Developing group problem-solving skills.

The "simulation" phase of the program is the most valuable. The materials for this are excellent, and the role-playing fosters rapid growth and development in administrative leadership.

Developing comprehensive philosophy: Life and Education (broader, liberal outlook).

The faculty associated directly with this program are extraordinarily capable. I was impressed on several occasions by their sensitivity to the needs, the readiness, and the incipient problems of participants. They took obvious care to differentiate assignments and to distribute work loads according to the individual needs and capabilities of the participants. It requires rare individuals, with good shares of patience, knowledge, sensitivity, and diplomacy, to make a program like this one succeed for most of the participants.

Weaknesses:

Participants might well have been involved in early planning sessions to determine some of the content and the structure of the year's experiences.

Some of the parallel courses selected from the "regular" graduate level curriculum of the school of education were of a secondary education level or inappropriate, but were the only courses currently available.

Not enough group social activities.

Attitude of some administrators of state junior colleges to the program.

Lack of "drive" on part of some participants.

Lacked emphasis on articulation.

There is a total absence of computer concepts, usage and training in the program.

Internship needs better planning.

It is difficult to find weaknesses in a program with which I have been so highly pleased and from which I have profited very much.

Specific Changes Recommended

I would like to see the program expanded to include more junior college personnel--especially members of the instructional staff. I would also like to see enough concentration of people in subject-matter areas to justify group work designed to upgrade the level of instruction for junior college students, especially the marginally prepared.

Compress the program to three quarters, leaving the last quarter for individual development.

More visitations of longer duration to really model comprehensive community colleges.

More staff utilization in preparation of the members for various stages of the program, like the practicum.

I would like to see short conferences in which members might participate with students, local administrators, and lay leaders in the area discussing problems associated with their respective situations and their solutions.

A new simulation problem should be used, as this one has been used twice now.

Strengthen the internship phase.

I would like to see one quarter devoted entirely to the internship with more time on location.

Provision of more time per week in the practicum phase of the program, with a reduction of a minimum of one related course per quarter to allow for increased time in the practicum.

During the first three months, i.e. the summer quarter, I feel that some time should be spent in covering specific information which would pertain to the practicum work that is to be carried on during the following two quarters. Many questions could have been answered which would have smoothed out some of the later problems.

At least one-half of the participants should have had experience in a vocational-technical school or in the occupational division of a community college and, hence, provide a more comprehensive base for a program for leadership in community colleges.

Further development of plans for in-service training for faculty would be a most helpful addition to the training received by the participants in the program.

Was the time spent justified?

The gain of self confidence I have experienced as a result of this year's study has more than compensated for the time spent.

This program raised my sights--made me really consider an administrative position in a junior college.

The philosophical change in attitude will better prepar me to be an administrator in a comprehensive community college.

The program increased my understanding of some of the problems facing junior colleges. Also, my attitude toward colleagues was greatly improved, I believe.

Personally, the practicum andintern programs alone were worth the time spent in the program.

Prior to the program I had no education or practical experience in educational administration at the junior college level. I now feel confident that I can make a significant contribution to the development of a junior college.

Experiences gained through the program revitalized my interest in and enthusiasm for the community college with the result that I am actively seeking a position of greater responsibility in my present institution.

My conception of the educational scene and my conception of myself as a professional operating in that scene are now much better differentiated and much bette developed than they were a year ago.

The learning experience was an asset to proficiency in my community college, career interest, over-justifying the time I spent in the program.

As I look back, I sincerely hope that I will be able to contribute to this movement in comparable measure to the attention, time, and money spent in my behalf through this year's activities.

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values. Each of the resident participants completed this scale at the beginning and end of the year. In addition, the Scale was completed by a Comparison Group drawn from the graduate students in the School of Education. At the end of the year the Junior College Leadership Group and the Comparison Group were compared statistically in an effort to determine if the program produced any significant value changes among the Leadership Group. The t-values and significance levels are shown in Table 14. The data revealed a significant change by the Junior College Leadership Group in two of the six factors--a decrease in theoretical value, and an increase in social value.

Table 14

TABLE OF t-VALUES COMPARING THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEAN SCORES OF THE JCLG ON THE STUDY OF VALUES SCALE (MALE[1] ONLY): N=23

Value	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference	t	p
Theoretical	42.13	39.56	-2.57	2.54	.02
Economic	40.13	38.15	-1.98	1.32	.20
Aesthetic	37.38	37.25	- .13	.06	ns
Social	41.43	43.08	1.65	3.00	.01
Political	40.26	41.39	1.13	.84	.20
Religious	38.69	39.93	1.24	.71	ns

[1]Because of the wide difference in sex norms for this instrument and the fact that each group contained only three females, only data collected from males were analyzed.

Group Cohesiveness.--Goldman's Study of Group Morale was administered to the Junior College Leadership Group and to the Comparison Group at the beginning and at the end of the year. It was hypothesized that the Leadership Group would show significant development in group cohesiveness through participation in the program. The mean scores and t-values are presented in Table 15 for the two groups.

Table 15

t-VALUE OF STUDY OF GROUP MORALE COMPARING GROUPS' PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEAN TOTAL SCORE

Group	Pre	Post	Change	t	p
JCLG	66.89	65.42	-1.47	.95	.20
CG	66.94	63.06	-3.88	2.20	.05

The data indicates that the group morale of both the Junior College Leadership Group and the Comparison Group may have declined during the year. However, the decrease in the JCLG's mean total score was not statistically significant (p .20) while the CG's decrease was considered significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus, from the evidence, it may be concluded that the Junior College Leadership Group successfully maintained high group morale, while that of graduate students not participating in the program declined.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.--This instrument was used in an attempt to determine if the experiences of the Junior College Leadership Group would cause the group to become more open. Table16 presents a summary of the data concerning the Dogmatism Scale. The pre-post comparison indicated a significant average change, with both groups becoming less dogmatic. The significant interaction indicated that the contrast between the extent of change was significantly greater for the Leadership Group than for the Comparison Group. Thus, the conclusion was drawn that both the groups became less dogmatic as a result of their year's experiences, but that the amount of change was significantly greater for the Junior College Leadership Group.

Table 16

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES ON DOGMATISM SCALE

Group	Pre	Post	Change	F	p
JCLG	-25.14	-35.88	-10.84	9.16	.005
CG	-28.78	-32.44	- 3.66	4.75	.05

Semantic Differential.--This semantic differential was designed to measure attitude toward selected junior college concepts. Higher scores on a semantic differential scale indicate greater acceptance of that concept. Table 17 summarizes the results of this measurement for the Junior College Leadership Group and for the Comparison Group.

Table 17

COMPARISON OF GROUPS' MEAN SCORES ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Concept	JCLG			CG		
	Pre	Post	Change	Pre	Post	Change
Open-Door	13.42	17.69	4.27	10.33	13.67	3.34
Comprehen-sive Prog.	12.71	17.50	4.79	12.55	13.50	.95
Transfer Education	14.15	15.62	1.47	15.44	11.94	-3.50
Continuing Education	13.31	18.19	4.88	10.94	16.17	5.23
Career Program	13.38	16.62	3.24	14.16	15.39	1.23
Faculty Involve-ment in Gover-nance	11.64	14.42	2.58	10.94	12.33	1.39
Salvage Function	10.67	14.50	3.83	7.78	8.11	.33
Student Involve-ment in Gover-nance	10.69	14.15	3.46	11.38	13.44	2.06
Community Service	13.73	18.00	4.27	16.72	16.77	.05
General Education	14.15	16.08	1.93	12.22	10.55	-1.67

To compare the mean scores of both the JCLG and the CG on all scales of the semantic differential, an ANOVA model (Three Factor Mixed Design: Repeated Measures on Two Factors) was chosen that would evaluate (1) the overall difference between groups on all concepts of the scale, (2) the pretest-posttest change in mean scores, (3) the difference between concepts, and (4) the interaction between these factors. Table 18 presents a summary of the results of this analysis.

Table 18

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE COMPARING GROUPS ON PRE vs POST TEST PERFORMANCE ON ALL CONCEPTS OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Total	43,340	879	49.30		
Between Sub.	23,929	43	556.49		
Groups	1,271	1	1,271.00	2.01	.20
$Error_b$	22,658	42	632.86		
Within Sub.	19,411	836	23.22		
Pre-Post	412	1	412.00	2.47	.20
Concepts	9,507	9	1,056.33	2854.94	.001
G x Pre-Post	750	1	750.00	4.49	.05
G x Concepts	444	9	49.33	129.82	.001
P-P x Concepts	1,002	9	111.33	654.88	.001
G x P-P x Concepts	76	9	8.44	49.65	.001
$Error_w$	7,220	798	9.05		
$Error_1$	7.011	42	166.93		
$Error_2$	145	378	.38		
$Error_3$	64	378	.17		

The analysis indicated that the concepts differed significantly ($F_{9,378}$ = 2854.94; p .001), which may be interpreted to mean that they were measuring different dimensions. The Groups x Pre-Post interaction was

significant ($F_{1,42} = 4.49$; p .05) indicating that the JCLG showed more overall change than did the CG. The significant Group x Concepts interaction ($F_{9,378} = 129.82$; p .001) indicates that the JCLG and the CG changes occurred for different concepts. The Pre-Post x Concepts interaction ($F_{9,378} = 654.88$; p .001) merely indicates that the overall change for specific concepts differs significantly. The Group x Pre-Post x Concepts interaction ($F_{9,378} = 49.65$; p .001) may be interpreted to indicate that the pre-post change for the JCLG and the CG differs significantly for certain concepts.

It may be concluded that both the Junior College Leadership Group and the Comparison Group showed a significant trend toward greater acceptance of the overall concepts, the JCLG showed a significant change in their attitude toward certain concepts, and there was a significant difference in the change of the groups' attitude toward one or more concepts. Once the ANOVA indicated that the mean scores of the JCLG changed significantly from pre to post-test on certain concepts, other tests were required to determine on which concepts this change occurred. Also, tests were needed to determine the concepts where the JCLG mean scores changed significantly more than those of the CG. Table 19 contains the results of these tests, using Duncan's multiple range test.[3]

---

[1] James L. Bruning and B. L. Kintz, Computational Handbook of Statistics, (Atlanta: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1968), p. 115.

Table 19

SUMMARY OF DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST COMPARING BOTH GROUPS ON ALL CONCEPTS OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE AND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CHANGE SCORE ON THE SAME SCALE

Concepts	JCLG				CG				Change Scores				
	Pre	Post	k	p	Pre	Post	k	p	JCLG	CG	Dif.	k	p
Open-Door	13.42	17.69	3.77	.005	10.33	13.67	3.16	.05	4.27	3.34	.93	2.44	ns
Comprehen-sive Prog.	12.71	17.50	4.42	.001	12.55	13.50	3.16	ns	4.79	.95	3.84	3.83	.01
Transfer Education	14.15	15.62	2.63	ns	15.44	11.94	3.16	.05	1.47	-3.50	4.79	4.17	.005
Continuing Education	13.31	18.19	4.42	.001	10.94	16.17	4.53	.005	4.88	5.23	.35	2.44	ns
Career Program	13.38	16.62	2.63	.05	14.16	15.39	3.16	ns	3.24	1.23	2.01	2.44	ns
Faculty Involve-ment in G'nance	11.64	14.42	2.63	ns	10.94	12.33	3.16	ns	2.58	1.39	1.19	2.44	ns
Salvage Function	10.67	14.50	3.77	.005	7.78	8.11	3.16	ns	3.83	.33	3.50	2.91	.05

Table 19--Continued

Concepts	JCLG				CG				Change Scores				
	Pre	Post	k	p	Pre	Post	k	p	JCLG	CG	Dif.	k	
Student Involvement in G'nance	10.69	14.15	2.63	.05	11.38	13.44	3.16	ns	3.46	2.06	1.40	2.44	ns
Community Service	13.73	18.00	3.77	.005	16.72	16.77	3.16	ns	4.27	.05	4.22	3.83	.01
General Education	14.15	16.08	2.63	ns	12.22	10.55	3.16	ns	1.93	-1.67	3.60	2.91	.05

Significant difference was indicated between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the JCLG on seven of the ten selected concepts (p .05). On two of these concepts, Comprehensive Program and Continuing Education, significance was beyond the .001 level of confidence and on three others--Open-door Policy, Salvage Function, and Community Service--significance was beyond the .005 level of confidence. No significant change was indicated in the JCLG's mean scores concerning Transfer Education, Faculty Involvement in Governance, and General Education. However, the JCLG's pretest mean scores on the concepts Transfer Education and General Education were both 14.15 on a scale which ranged from -30 to +30. Hence, there was limited room for improvement of their attitude toward these concepts.

While the change in the mean scores of the JCLG was significant on seven concepts, the change in the mean scores of the CG was significant on only three of the ten concepts. The change in one of these mean scores, Transfer Education, was negative. Thus, the indications are that the Junior College Leadership Group showed significantly greater acceptance of seven of the ten concepts, while the Comparison Group showed significantly greater acceptance of two concepts.

In-Service Phase

The formal evaluation of the in-service phase consisted of the Participant Evaluation Form. Informal evaluation was practically constant through the excellent Staff-Participant rapport which was established.

Office of Education Participant Evaluation Form.--This form was completed in a usable form by forty-nine of the sixty in-service participants. There was general agreement that the program was in accord with their previous background and experience and that the program was of the proper length. At the end of the two-week conference in July, there was obvious excitement in the group as a whole concerning their experiences in the Project.

Data summarizing evaluations of program activities are found in Tables 20 and 21. The in-service group evaluation agreed with that of the resident group in the veiw that attitude change and improved communications were the most important aspects of the program. The principal strengths of the program as seen by this group were: Staff-Participant Rapport, Consultants, Group Rapport, Program Effectiveness, and Learning Atmosphere. Of these, Learning Atmosphere and Consultants received the highest rating by the group.

Table 20

IN-SERVICE GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS IN SECTION C
OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

Item	Rank N/A	1	2	TOTAL
Content	7	10	2	
Attitude Change		14	19	
Methodology	5		6	
Characteristics of Learning	3	2	2	
Communication	2	18	10	
TOTAL RESPONDING (N)				49

Table 21

IN-SERVICE GROUP RANKING OF ITEMS IN SECTION D

Item	Rank* N/A	A	B	C	D	N/R	N
Learning Atmosphere	-	42	6	-	-	1	49
Living-Dining	1	4	31	12	-	1	49
Program Effectiveness	-	37	11	-	-	1	49
Full-time Staff	14	31	3	-	-	1	49
Part-time Staff	21	21	4	-	-	3	49
Consultants	-	42	7	-	-	-	49
Facilities	-	27	19	1	-	2	49
Group Rapport	-	37	12	-	-	-	49
Staff-Participant Rapport	3	40	6	-	-	-	49

*Key: N/A Not Applicable
A Exceeded Expectations
B Met Expectations
C Did Not Satisfy Expectations
D A Major Area of Weakness
N/R No Response

Comments contained in the summary evaluation of the Participant Evaluation Form for the non-resident participants were as follows:

Strengths

Gave me a broader base to draw from in coping and solving administrative problems. Sharpened my interest in problems which had previously been considered minor.

The consultants were excellent. The pace of the program was exactly right. Generally, it would be hard to improve upon this program. It is the best program of this type I have ever attended.

Very well organized for maximum benefit to the participant.

The workshop leaders know how to organize, and are experts in their field. Always ready to discuss individual problems.

Variety of subject areas covered.

The sequence of topics, the preparation of the speakers, the warm, friendly, provocative atmosphere created, the caliber of participants, the hard work of the director.

The most outstanding workshop I have ever attended.

Weaknesses

Would like to have seen some of the newer instructional techniques in action. Would like to have seen more of the learning resources center and how it is used.

Perhaps a little too much was scheduled in several mornings.

Not enough time for questions following major speakers.

I cannot identify a weakness in this workshop.

Lack of time

Housing of participants.

I honestly cannot think of a weakness.

Specific Changes Recommended

No comment.

The group activities would have been more effective if spread more evenly throughout the two weeks rather than concentrated in the first week.

I would like to see more concentrated efforts in the area of community services.

More opportunity to discuss problems with experts on the staff at Auburn University.

The only change I would advise is longer and more of the same programs. The program was great.

I see no need for change.

More time with consultants in smaller groups.

More funds available that more workshops could be offered; that is a greater number of faculty members be able to attend the workshop. Maybe by having two or three workshops per summer.

Opportunity for "interest groups"--possibly in evening sessions.

Was Program Justified?

Yes. Gave me a broader base to draw from in solving administrative problems.

Yes. It has greatly influenced my views. I would gladly attend another such program.

Very much so. I have been in junior college work for many years and this just makes me more aware of what we can do and what needs we can try to meet in the future.

Yes. Coming from a different section of the country, I was grateful to learn that the philosophy of community college education is emerging over our nation, and I am convinced more than ever that it is right and correct.

Without a doubt.

I was able to gain many insights that I probably would not have had if I had not been a member.

Yes. It has given me a broader prospective of the junior college and allowed me the opportunity of exchanging ideas with people from a large cross-section of the southeast.

Yes. It forced me to look beyond my exact potition and area of specialization and focus on institutional problems; new approaches; trends. I would hope to go home with a less narrow outlook as to how I can participate in the administration of our entire institution, not just my immediate sphere of influence or responsibility.

I have attended several conferences this year but none have stimulated my thoughts about needed changes like this workshop has. I am ready to change the world.

It was an experience well worth the time devoted. It would be hard to find the kind of information given us through this conference anywhere else except in a workshop situation.

Yes. It helped me understand much better every aspect of the junior college development. The atmosphere was excellent and I am planning to duplicate same atmosphere in my courses.

Definitely. Both from the aspect of contact with the experts and with the participants. I like very much the generout time given to discussion and reactions. I especially appreciated emphasis upon the student-centered educational program, participation by the whole college family in policy decisions, and development of behavioral objectives.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the Project was to bring together individuals from the Southeastern states who were practicing or aspiring to practice a particular specialty in junior college education so that they might become involved in planned activities necessitating full consideration of the part played by each specialty in a concerted leadership effort. Activities were planned so that they would demand consideration of regional influences upon the community college and thus to enable participants to better understand their state in relation to the Southeastern region.

Two specific groups were served. The in-service portion of the Project involved approximately sixty persons for a two-week conference; the resident phase involved twenty-six persons for a concentrated program of activity extending over one calendar year, and included the two-week conference for the in-service group.

The procedure for evaluation was guided primarily by the first two objectives as stated in the original proposal:

A. To improve the competency of each participant in his own specialty; and

B. To increase the awareness of each specialist of the role of his specialty in the scheme of the junior college and the relationship of this specialty to the other specialties and the total enterprise.

Conclusions

1. The team-approach to the solution of simulated problems provides valuable insight into the inter-relationships existing among various specialties.

2. Role-play in problem solving enables individuals to view problems from more than one position and thus to better understand the factors which must be considered when decisions are required.

3. It is possible to effect attitude changes through group interaction; and further, it is possible to measure the degree and direction of those changes.

4. The participants of both phases of the Project were enthusiastic about the over-all operation of the program.

5. There is evidence that the individuals who participated in the Project will be given the opportunity to utilize their knowledge within Southeastern junior colleges.

Recommendations

Based on the experiences of this Project and the evaluation, the following recommendations are offered:

1. There should be a greater utilization of field experiences in future leadership programs through the joint efforts of the coordinating institution and the participating community colleges. The periods of residence study and field experiences should be alternated in order to better correlate theory with practice.

2. If possible, there should be greater opportunity for interaction between the resident program and the in-service program participants.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT STAFF
PRINCIPAL STAFF

Director

NAME: E. B. Moore, Jr.

TITLE: Coordinator of Graduate Programs for Junior College Faculty

DEGREES:

A.B., Syracuse University, 1960
M.B.A., Syracuse University, 1960
Ed.D., University of Florida, 1966

Associate Director

NAME: Charles A. Atwell

TITLE: Assistant Professor Of Educational Administration

DEGREES:

B.S.E., University of Florida, 1955
M.Ed., University of Florida, 1960
Ed.D., University of Florida, 1968

NAME: Paul K. Preus

TITLE: Assistant Professor Of Educational Administration

DEGREES:

A.B., Luther College, 1937
B. E., College Puget Sound, 1939
M.E.D., Central Washington State, 1962
Ph.D., University of Texas, 1969

NAME: Douglas F. Williams

TITLE: Assistant Professor Of Educational Administration

DEGREES:

B.A., 1950, Northern Michigan University
M.A., 1953, University of Michigan
Ph.D., 1970, University of Texas at Austin

PART-TIME STAFF

NAME: Mark Eugene Meadows

TITLE: Head Professor, Counselor Education

DEGREES:

B.S., 1957, Georgia Southern College
M.A., 1960, George Peabody College
Ed.D., 1966, University of Georgia

NAME: Edwin L. Kurth

TITLE: Professor, Vocational and Adult Education

DEGREES:

B.S., 1938, State Normal and Industrial College
M.Ed., 1949, Colorado State University
Ed.D., 1955, University of Florida

GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Harold L. Underwood
Vincent M. Marquess

SECRETARY

Laural Snowden

APPENDIX B

COMPETENCY PROFILE

PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL

Periodic evaluation, an integral part of practicum, has several purposes.

1. It gives each student an opportunity and an occasion for self-evaluation.

2. Concurrently, each student will have the benefit of a parallel evaluation by his instructor.

3. When working with a team or group, each student has an opportunity to evaluate the team members. (Evaluation of other personnel in the junior college organization is considered an important function of any administrator.)

4. It provides self and colleague evaluation which is considered essential to the professional growth of an administrator.

Since it is considered an opportunity for learning and growth, it is intended that this evaluation be conducted in a threat-free atmosphere. All evaluation records will be handled personally by the project director. He will schedule a conference with each member of the project group for the purpose of discussing the results of the evaluation. There will be no other dissemination of the information.

COMPETENCY PROFILE RESPONSE SHEET

INSTRUCTION

Each student is provided five response forms. He will rate himself and the other four members of his team. Be sure to identify both the evaluator and the subject of the evaluation.

The forms are to be given to Dr. Moore.

COMPETENCY PROFILE

1. Skill in delegating authority and responsibility to others.
2. Ability to inspire confidence of subordinates.
3. Listens attentively to ideas of fellow workers.
4. Actively seeks the opinion of fellow workers.
5. Accepts the suggestions of key co-workers.
6. Keeps abreast of new concepts in education.
7. Maintains open communications with superordinates.
8. Understands and accepts the functions of complementary community agencies.
9. Open to new innovations in education and willing to apply new ideas.
10. Actively engaged in professional organizations.
11. Emphathetic to the problems of teachers and students.
12. Actively seeks the most qualified personnel for tasks.
13. Verbal and written communication is easily understand.
14. Genuinely cares for other people.
15. Actively engages in community activities.
16. Respects the right of student dissent.
17. Places the rights of the individual above the institution.
18. Maintains a sense of humor and has the ability to laugh at self.
19. Accepting of changing social habits of young people.
20. Refrains from publicly making value judgments about fellow personnel.
21. Has abiding respect for scholarship and erudition.
22. Maintains a scholarly interest in the "disciplines".

23. Understands the impact of technology on education.

24. Keeps abreast of international affairs and realizes their impact on human behavior.

25. Desists from forcing own values on others.

26. Emphathetic to the problems of minority groups.

27. Treats all persons alike regardless of ethnic or religious affiliation.

28. Treats non-professional school personnel with dignity and respect.

29. Subscribes to the doctrine of academic freedom in the classroom.

30. Gives dimension and direction to group meetings when serving as leader.

31. Skill in participating in group endeavors when official status is not exercised.

32. Social graces and personal grooming requisite in our society.

33. Clear-cut understanding of the total scope of the modern college program.

34. A commitment to continuous growth in service.

35. Insight into objectives of the junior college curriculums.

36. Understanding of objectives, curriculum, organization procedures, methods, materials, and major issues confronting junior college education.

37. Understanding the philosophy of the junior college and its history.

38. Knowledge of effective procedures for assuring constructive participation by citizens in shaping the college program.

39. Knowledge of specific practices and procedures in organizing the total program of junior college (e.g., knowledge of the units of the various types of organization of public and private junior colleges, as 6-3-3, -2, etc.).

40. Knowledge of the basic provisions for financing public and private junior colleges.

41. Knowledge of continuous flow of the literature in education, particularly in the junior college.

42. Abilities in the location, interpretation, evaluation and application of pertinent research evidence on educational problems.

43. Knowledge of personal attributes and qualifications of a junior college administrator.

44. Content knowledge in major fields involved in educational administration; e.g., finance, curriculum, etc.

45. Ability to gather and interpret pertinent information about the community.

46. Technical-level skill in performing managerial duties of a president, dean, etc., in a junior college.

Subject _____ Evaluator _____

1. Least characteristic
2. Somewhat characteristic of him (me).
3. Characteristic of him (me) on occasion.
4. Characteristic of him (me) often.

	1	2	3	4
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				
21.				
22.				
23.				
24.				
25.				
26.				
27.				
28.				
29.				
30.				
31.				
32.				
33.				
34.				
35.				
36.				
37.				
38.				
39.				
40.				
41.				
42.				
43.				
44.				
45.				
46.				

APPENDIX C

Typical Four-Quarter Course of Study Each Administrative Specialty

Presidents or Academic Deans

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 697 Student Personnel Work in Higher Education
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program
SY 608 Organizational Analysis

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
SP 673 Seminar in Discussion
VED 608 Administration of Vocational and Practical Arts Education
AED 692 Constitutional, Statutory and Judicial Foundations of Education

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration
AED 618 Organization and Administration of Higher Education
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
IED 666 Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education
AED 686 Administration and Policy Formulation
AED 688 School Finance and Business Administration

Student Personnel Administrators

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 697 Student Personnel Work in Higher Education
SY 608 Organizational Aralysis
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
VED 608 Administration of Vocational & Practical Arts Education
CED 631 Group Procedures in Counseling

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
CED 653 Counseling Programs in Higher Education
AED 618 Organization & Administration of Higher Education
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
AED 692 Constitutional, Statutory and Judicial Foundations of Education
FED 617 Advanced Educational Psychology
AED 685 Administrative Organization and Behavior

Heads of Academic Division

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program
2 courses in their academic discipline

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
VED 608 Administration of Vocational & Practical Arts Education
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration
1 course in their academic discipline

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
FED 617 Advanced Educational Psychology
IED 648 Advanced Study of Curriculum & Teaching
1 course in their academic discipline

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
IED 666 Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education
1 course in their academic discipline

Heads of Technical Divisions

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AS 662 Social Systems and Communities
VED 608 Administration of Vocational & Practical Arts Education
AED 697 Student Personnel Work in Higher Education

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 670 Supervision of the Instructional Program
VED 413 Nature of Adult Education
VED 652 Curriculum and Teaching in Vocational, Technical, and Practical Arts Education

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
FED 617 Advanced Educational Psychology
IED 648 Advanced Study of Curriculum and Teaching
AED 618 Organization and Administration of Higher Education

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
IED 666 Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education
VED 602 Teacher Education in Vocational and Practical Arts
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration

Business Managers

Summer Quarter

IED 665 The Community College
AED 688 School Finance and Business Administration
PO 635 Seminar in Public Administration
AED 689 Educational Plant Maintenance

Fall Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 683 The Leadership Role in Educational Administration
EC 650 Economic Seminar
VED 608 Administration of Vocational and Practical Arts Education

Winter Quarter

AED 659 Practicum
AED 618 Organization and Administration of Higher Education
AED 692 Constitutional, Statutory and Judicial Foundations of Education
AED 693 Personnel Administration

Spring Quarter

AED 651 Internship
AED 690 Educational Business Management
AED 685 Administrative Organization and Behavior
AED 686 Administrative and Policy Formulation

APPENDIX D

Course Descriptions - Higher Education Sequence

IED 665 - The Community College

The rise and development of the community or junior college in American education, its philosophy and functions; specific attention to the transfer, terminal, and community-service functions. Includes problems of organization, curriculum construction, staffing and instructional procedures.

IED 663 - The American College and University
(Also an introductory course. Not normally required of junior college majors.)

Philosophy and function, the university and social change, the community college, academic freedom, student-faculty-community relationships; international flow of educational ideas, government cultural programs, higher education and the state.

IED 645 - Problems of Teaching the Marginally Prepared College Student

Socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds as they affect learning styles of the marginally prepared student. Develop methods of appropriate teaching strategies as a means of improving the self-concept of these students.

IED 666 - Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education (Course title presently being changed to The Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction.)

The development and selection of appropriate curricular materials and effective teaching strategies. Evaluation of instruction and learning effectiveness in undergraduate programs of higher education.

AED 618 - Organization and Administration of Higher Education

A course designed for educational leaders in higher education to provide a study of the organization, administration, and evaluation of institutions in higher education in terms of the academic program student personnel services, business affairs, and related programs. Includes the relationship between higher education and the state and federal government.

AED 651 - Internship in Area of Specialization - (This course was used for the field experience component of the Project described in detail in the Residence Phase, Spring Quarter section of this report.)

Provides advanced graduate students with full-time, supervised, on-the-job experiences in a school, college, or other appropriate setting. These experiences will be accompanied by regularly scheduled, on-campus

APPENDIX D

Course Descriptions - Higher Education Sequence

IED 665 - The Community College

The rise and development of the community or junior college in American education, its philosophy and functions; specific attention to the transfer, terminal, and community-service functions. Includes problems of organization, curriculum construction, staffing and instructional procedures.

IED 663 - The American College and University

(Also an introductory course. Not normally required of junior college majors.)

Philosophy and function, the university and social change, the community college, academic freedom, student-faculty-community relationships; international flow of educational ideas, government cultural programs, higher education and the state.

IED 645 - Problems of Teaching the Marginally Prepared College Student

Socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds as they affect learning styles of the marginally prepared student. Develop methods of appropriate teaching strategies as a means of improving the self-concept of these students.

IED 666 - Undergraduate Instruction in Higher Education (Course title presently being changed to The Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction.)

The development and selection of appropriate curricular materials and effective teaching strategies. Evaluation of instruction and learning effectiveness in undergraduate programs of higher education.

AED 618 - Organization and Administration of Higher Education

A course designed for educational leaders in higher education to provide a study of the organization, administration, and evaluation of institutions in higher education in terms of the academic program student personnel services, business affairs, and related programs. Includes the relationship between higher education and the state and federal government.

AED 651 - Internship in Area of Specialization - (This course was used for the field experience component of the Project described in detail in the Residence Phase, Spring Quarter section of this report.)

Provides advanced graduate students with full-time, supervised, on-the-job experiences in a school, college, or other appropriate setting. These experiences will be accompanied by regularly scheduled, on-campus

discussion periods, designed to provide positive evaluation and analysis of the field experience.

AED 659 - Practicum in Area of Specialization (The extensive team problem-solving and simulation activities were conducted in this course. See the section of this report entitled Residence Phase, Fall and Winter Quarter, for a complete description of these activities.)

The practicum provides advanced graduate students with supervised experiences with emphasis on the application of concepts, principles, and skills acquired in previous course work.

AED 697 - Student Personnel Work in Higher Education

A study of theories, principles, practices, organization, administration, and evaluation of student personnel services in higher education.

APPENDIX E

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

The purpose of this study is to determine how you feel about certain concepts. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this booklet you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair __X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: unfair

OR

fair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__X__: unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

strong_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: weak

OR

strong_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____: weak

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

safe_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:dangerous

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces,

not on the boundaries:

_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____X_____:_____:
this not this

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept

do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgement. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

Concept: Open-door Policy

Beautiful	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Ugly
Bad	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Good
Optimistic	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Pessimistic
Unpleasant	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Pleasant
Positive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Negative
Hard	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Soft
Clean	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Dirty
Tasty	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Distasteful
Hazy	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Clear
Valuable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	Worthless

(Each of the 10 concepts measured was treated as illustrated here)

APPENDIX F

RESIDENT PARTICIPANTS

Lydia L. Alexander
Graham G. Anthony
Frank A. Bailey
* David A. Barksdale
James Blackwell
Ben Clements
Richard B. Cooper
* James F. Crabtree
* J. T. Ford
James Guth
Edwin E. Kirchhoff
* Dan MacMillan
William Carroll Marsalis
William L. Mitchell
Winston S. Moody
* Peggy Morrison
* William P. Pannell
Stewart Phillips
Fred Robbins
Lew Roberts
Herbert Temple
Julius B. Thrower
John Vance
Douglas D. Warren
Carl Witty
Mavis F. Wooten

* These were non-supported

APPENDIX G

IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS

Adams, Robert M.
Barnes, Douglas R.
Black, Augustus M.
Boyd, Marilyn A.
Burr, James E.
Campbell, Sister Celine
Chitwood, Howard C.
Coley, Beatrice V.
Crabtree, James F.
Crago, Arthur G.
Crenshaw, Susie W.
Croker, George W., Jr.
Davis, Charles W.
Dillard, Marjorie G.
Doerner, Kern L.
Durgan, Mrs. Ira H.
Fentress, Neal T.
Foster, Bernice W.
Green, Virginia S.
Griggs, Shirley H.
Grimes, Eugene S., Jr.
Gulledge, Evelyn S.
Hackbarth, Harlan
Harrison, Sister Eleanor M.
Huang, Harriet
Hurd, Paul S.
Jones, Cleophas
Jones, L. Ray
Jones, Ronald L.
Karibo, Sister Patricia A.
Kirby, William E.
Larson, Melvin J.
Lecuona, Fernando
Little, Jack N.
Long, Floyd H.
McCracken, Richard D.
McGill, James H.
Marcinowski, Mary E.
Michel, Sister Mary L.
Miller, Frank
Morhouse, Charles D.
Moulton, Robert O.
Nelson, Joyce T.
Palmer, Charles B.
Pate, Marie M.
Puyear, Donald E.
Rayburn, James G.
Schulken, Emma W.
Synco, John A.
Thomas, Frank H.
Thompson, Seaborn A.
Trees, Philip L.
True, Sister Bertha
Vaughn, George B.
Wallace, Burma M.
Wallette, Dennis L.
West, Curtis D., Jr.
Williams, Addie W.
Williams, Katie T.
Zellhoefer, John A.